

Journal of
Economic and Social Thought

www.kspjournals.org

Volume 5

December 2018

Issue 4

The effect of demographic variables on the university's
proactive personality and uncertainty avoidance

By Okan ŞENELDİR^{a†} & Burcu ÜZÜM^b
& Leyla ŞENOL^c

Abstract. The aim of this study is to determine the relationship between the demographic variables of the students studying in Kocaeli Vocational School of Business Administration program and their tendency to avoid uncertainty. In this study, the cultural dimensions scale of Hofstede used by Altay (2004) was used to measure the tendency to avoid uncertainty. In this study, the Proactive personality scale of Bateman and Crant used by Akgündüz *et al.*, (2017) was used to measure the tendency to proactive personality. In addition, questions were asked about the demographic variables (gender, mother is or not life, the status of the parents, the income level, the educational status of the parents, number of siblings and success status). The sampling method was used easily in the study. The sample of the study consisted of 154 students. The data were analyzed by SPSS program. The significance level was accepted as 0.05. It was seen that demographic variables of university students had no effect on proactive personality and avoidance of uncertainty.

Keywords. Proactive personality, Uncertainty avoidance, Demographic variables.

JEL. I20, M50, M10, M13.

1. Introduction

Individuals; are affected by not only education, belief, family structure, socioeconomic status but also the characteristics of the community they are in. As a result of all these relations, the approach of the individual to the events varies and this situation affects their behavior. Proactivity and avoidance of uncertainty are the factors affecting the individual's education, lifestyle, health etc as well as all their choices and behaviours (Uzuntarla, Firat & Ceylan, 2016: 207). Proactive strategies are open to the public and take the needs of the public into account; while reactive strategies are those that consider the corporate benefit. There is a mutual relationship and an interaction between the cooperation and the environment either in a reactive way (adaption to the environment) or proactive way (changing the environment) (Ülgen & Mirze, 2004: 80). Organizations enter reactive mode when accusations or criticisms are made against them. Organizations should develop targets to increase public confidence and support against external reactions. Avoidance of uncertainty tries to measure whether people prefer certainty or uncertainty in their lives. In a sense, innovation is a matter of change and

^{a†} Kocaeli University, Kocaeli Vocational School, Kocaeli, Turkey.

☎ . +90 262 351 34 82

✉ . seneldir@kocaeli.edu.tr

^b Ali Rıza Veroğlu Vocational School, Kocaeli, Turkey.

☎ . +90 262 351 34 82

✉ . burcugokay@gmail.com

^c Ali Rıza Veroğlu Vocational School, Kocaeli, Turkey.

☎ . +90 262 351 34 82

✉ . leyla.senol@kocaeli.edu.tr

uncertainty, so there is more opposition to innovation in societies where avoidance of uncertainty is strong (Kaasa & Vadi, 2008). Innovation creators are prevented by the rules and structures that exist in these societies where avoidance of uncertainty is strong. It is stated that the implementation of innovation activities in societies where avoidance of uncertainty is high is caused by the fact that individuals who participate in innovation activities violate existing rules, procedures and norms. Uncertainty avoidance is expressed as the degree of tolerance of society to events involving uncertainty and confusion (Azizoğlu, 2011). An indefinite situation is a situation that cannot be fully defined and explained by individuals due to insufficient knowledge (Yeloğlu, 2011). Uncertain situations include the conditions where individuals are not comfortable and they perceive the situation as a threat (Altay, 2004). Individuals often exhibit varying degrees of uncertainty avoidance behavior (Tosunoğlu & Yeşilçelebi, 2016). This difference arises from the cultural diversity of societies (Çaloğlu, 2014). Individuals with uncertainty feel threatened, have uneasiness, worry (Doğan, 2007). It is known that anxiety affects individuals' health status and is associated with many diseases. The aim of this study is to determine the relationship between proactive personality and avoidance of uncertainty.

2. Theory and literature

2.1. Personality characteristics

Various psychiatric definitions of personality have been made. In clinical applications, it has been considered generally through two approaches which can be classified as categorical and dimensional. According to the categorical approach, the personality consists of different classes. According to the dimensional approach, the personality consists of certain dimensions (Taymur & Türkçapar, 2012). Humanbeing is the one who is formed of the original, constant and holistic behaviours in their relationship with the environment (Şahin & Aksu, 2015). Briefly, the personality is the whole of the behaviors of the individual against social events. The psychological and physical interactions of individuals in social sense are different. This difference leads people to differ from each other. It is the factor separating the individual from other individuals (Güzel, 2010). It is the combination of elements such as personality, self, temperament, habit, character, identity, ability etc (Köknel, 1999). The most widely used theory among personality theories is Five Factor Personality Theory. This theory is based on the property approach. This model is considered as an important stage in terms of personality psychology (Doğan, 2013). Proactivity is defined as all efforts to control or influence future situations that have not yet emerged. There is a dynamic interaction between proactive behavior and the environment. The relationship between the individual and the environment is a process characterized by mutual causality (Bateman & Crant, 1993a).

2.2. Proactive personality

Being proactive is expressed as the ability of people to be able to visualize the future and take the initiatives to determine concrete action steps so as to achieve the desired goals or objectives (Presbitero, 2015). Those with proactive personality are those who are not limited to situational constraints, affect environmental change, take opportunities, take initiatives, take action and have patience until change (Bateman & Crant, 1993b). Employees with proactive personality traits strive to achieve their goals without being limited to internal or external constraints. A proactive person knows his own values and manages his actions. It has been realized that proactive personality is a positive personality in coping with stress, taking the lead, taking initiative, and working with a compatible team work (Karşlı, 2018). Individuals' situation is affected by the person-environment relationship. People can change their current situation consciously and directly. This behavior is one of the main features of proactive behavior. There is a dynamic

interaction between proactive behavior and the environment. The relationship between the individual and the environment is a process characterized by mutual causality (Bateman, & Crant, 1993c). As a reflection of culture, the fact that people can predict and perceive opportunities can be defined as proactive behavior (Duygulu, 2008a). Organizational support, meaningfulness and proactive personality characteristics increase the creativity characteristics of the employees (Akgündüz, Gök & Alkan, 2017a). In the field researches, it was determined that proactive personality traits increase the intrinsic motivation of the employees (Horng *et. al.*, 2016). The concept of entrepreneurship, which has a close relationship with proactivity, comes from Latin (Korkmaz, 2000). The trend of entrepreneurship that promotes economic development (Knight, 1997), has great importance especially for the countries whose economic conditions are weak. The word “trend” in the Turkish Language Association’s dictionary is described as a tendency to love, to want or to do something. Entrepreneurial tendency refers to the person's tendency to take a new initiative (Chelariu, *et. al.*, 2008). In terms of enterprises, entrepreneurship tendency is the ability of the senior management to assume the planned risks, to make innovation and to exhibit proactive behaviors (Todorovic, McNaughton & Guild, 2011). Therefore, entrepreneurship tendency often refers to the top management strategy for innovation, proactivity and risk taking (Poon, Ainuddin, & Junit, 2006). Until today, various theories have been proposed to explain personality; however, in recent years, the theory that has been the source of the most research is five-factor personality theory (McCrae & Costa, 1990). This theory suggests that personality consists of five major factors: openness, extraversion, responsibility, compliance, and emotional balance. Proactive behavior as a reflection of culture can be defined by anticipating opportunities in individuals, perceiving and pursuing, participation in new markets, and entrepreneurial intent. For this reason, proactivity is defined as a vital element of entrepreneurship in the implementation of interventional activities. Proactive individuals are seen as those who can see what is necessary and why it is necessary to convert new opportunities into capital, gain and advance before the others (Lee & Peterson, 2000). Proactive behavior is based on the belief that there is a desire to control and manage the environment. Proactivity can be defined as an individual entrepreneurial feature. The dimension of proactivity which is one of the dimensions of internal entrepreneurship refers to the senior management’s taking initiative to increase the organization’s supremacy of competition in a brave way (Öktem, *et. al.*, 2003). In another study examining the relationship between internal entrepreneurship and proactivity, a significant and positive relationship was found between the creativity and proactive personality traits of the employees. It is suggested that risk taking and competitive aggression should be evaluated within the scope of proactivity dimension. Proactiveness is to try to be the first one rather than to follow the competitors in such matters as trying new products or services, opening new markets, applying new managerial techniques and technologies, determining strategy and changing organizational structure (Antoncic & Hisrich, 2001). The organization's ability to follow market opportunities, product, service, technology, management strategies, restructuring and to take a leading role in the sector, the ability to shape the environment can be evaluated within the scope of proactivity. Proactive activities in enterprises is to explore the opportunities, to shape the competitive order and environment, to develop appropriate strategies to meet the changing demands, to play an active role in market change, to offer new products and services to the market first (Bulut *et. al.*, 2007). Proactivity refers to being a pioneer in evaluating market opportunities (Ağca & Kurt, 2007). As a personality trait that is similar to proactive personality, autonomy can be considered. Sociotropic personality trait can contribute positively to proactive personality to a certain extent. Sociotropy and autonomy, which are also associated with entrepreneurship, have been included in the cognitive theory of Beck et al as the two significant dimensions of personality (Clark & Beck, 1991). In this theory, sociotropy (social belonging) is defined as the ability of the individual to show

positive interaction with others. For people showing sociotropy characteristics, it is very important to get approval from other people. The fact that these individuals can sustain positive self-images depends on their approval, being liked, being counted and being cared for by those who are important to them (Otacıoğlu, 2008). Significant features of sociotropic individuals are dependency, attention to interpersonal relationships, and orientation to others. Therefore, sociotropic persons need the support, closeness, guidance and help of others so badly (Blatt & Zuroff, 1992). Autonomy is defined as the ability to protect and increase the independence of the individual and his / her personal rights. People with a high level of autonomy are happy to direct their activities, reach their goals, control what is happening around them, and be successful. The characteristic features of autonomous persons are; self-criticism, dominant goal orientation and dominant self-definition. Hence, autonomous individuals attach importance to independence, success and control, and tend to trust their own resources. People with high autonomic characteristics like to direct their own activities and to accomplish the things that are important to them. In a study which has investigated the relationship between sociotropy-autonomy and entrepreneurial trends indirectly in Turkey, it has been found that girls are sociotropy while boys are autonomic (Serinkan & Barutçu, 2006). Organizational support, business meaningfulness and proactive personality traits are determined to increase the creativity of the employees. In this context, hotel managers should support the decisions and practices within the organization to increase the creativity of employees. Employees should be given the opportunity to carry out the tasks they care about. It is recommended that employees with proactive personality characteristics must be positioned in the organization (Akgündüz, Gök & Alkan, 2017b). In a study on the students of the Institute of Social Sciences of Dokuz Eylül University, the following conclusion has been reached; Proactive behavior as an entrepreneur characteristic does not explain the attitude of starting a business (Duygulu, 2008b).

2.3.Uncertainty avoidance and risk

Avoidance of uncertainty expresses the concern felt when there is insufficient data and the rate and extent of change cannot be estimated (Öncül *et. al.*, 2016: 257). As the avoidance of uncertainty increases, when there is an unclear situation, the individuals will not feel comfortable and the unknown situations will be perceived as a threat (Oliver & Karen, 1999: 745). Avoidance of uncertainty relates to how people behave in the face of uncertainty, and the level of oppression on the society in relation to the unknown side of the future. It concerns the level of unease in a community, in which information is insufficient or unclear, complexity exists, and where changes occur rapidly and unpredictably. People face significant problems in adapting to uncertain environments. Individuals feel threatened in situations where information is wrong or unclear, complexity exists, and changes develop rapidly and unpredictably. In societies, excessive uncertainty creates an intolerable tension and societies develop methods of dealing with this tension (Korkmaz, 2009: 37).

Societies can be classified as high and low societies that tend to avoid uncertainty. Communities with high uncertainty avoidance tend to exhibit relatively more emotionality. These societies have a high level of anxiety and high work stress. Employees have a high level of concern for the future and work stress (Öncül *et. al.*, 2016: 260). High emotional response to change is shown. Hierarchical rules must be applied in organizations, organizational rules are not violated. If people living in a given society have a high tendency to avoid uncertainty, they will aim at absolute truths by opposing different thoughts and behaviors in order to make life safer. In societies that avoid uncertainty, careers, retirement fees and charges are important. Rules and regulations are expressed in detail and clearly, risk appetite is low, managers do not want to take risks. It is important to organize organizational activities in societies where avoidance of uncertainty is high; labor force turnover is low; low ambition is seen among

individuals. Low desire is seen for personal improvements. In societies with low uncertainty avoidance, organizational structuring is more flexible, written rules are less, managers do not avoid taking risks, the transfer rate is high among employees, and employees are too ambitious to be very successful. In addition, organizations support the employee to use his or her initiative. Individuals in societies with a low tendency to avoid uncertainty is tolerant to different behaviors and thoughts (Park, Borde & Choi, 2002). In societies with low uncertainty avoidance; low anxiety level, good intentions about daily life, low work stress and low emotional reactions to change are seen. In organizations, loyalty to the employer is not accepted as a virtue, conflict between generations is not seen much. Managers can also be selected by other criterias than age criteria. There is a strong passion for high risk taking and individual progress. The manager does not need to be an expert in the field he manages. Hierarchy can be broken for utilitarian (pragmatic) reasons (Korkmaz, 2009: 38).

The main values and trends caused by avoidance of uncertainty in organizational / managerial environment and practices are summarized in Table 1 (Hofstede, 2001: 169-170):

Table 1. *Primary values and trends by uncertainty avoidance in organizational / managerial environment and applications*

Avoiding uncertainty in low level	Avoiding uncertainty in high level
Less written rules.	More written rules.
Managers is for employees.	Managers is for tasks.
Managers concentrate on strategies.	Managers concentrate on the details.
Managers' tending to take risk is high.	Managers' tending to take risk is low.
Managers may not know everything.	Managers know everything.
Managers are chosen according to some criteria rather than the years of experience.	Managers are chosen according to the excess of their years of experience.
Resistance to change is low.	There is high resistance to change.
It is emphasized that conflict is natural.	Conflict is not desirable.
If necessary, employees may violate the firm rules.	Firm rules cannot be violated.
Employees have high job satisfaction.	Employees have low job satisfaction.

As can be seen in Table 1, there is a high tendency for managers to take risk in tolerant organizations against uncertainty. In addition, resistance to change is low.

The main differences in uncertainty avoidance at the community level are summarized in Table 2. (Hofstede, 2001: 160-161):

Table 2. *Major values and trends at community level, caused by uncertainty avoidance*

Avoiding uncertainty in low level	Avoiding uncertainty in high level
Things that are different, arouses curiosity.	Things that are different are dangerous.
Expressing emotions is normal.	Emotions should be checked.
People are interested in learning and discussion.	People are oriented towards order and correct answers.
The rules are flexible.	The rules are strict.
Rules are as much as needed.	Although it is not necessary, there are rules.
Punctuality and rigor should be taught.	Punctuality and rigor are natural human behavior.
No discomfort is felt during laziness.	There is a continuous busy attitude.
There can be many true.	There is only one right.

As seen in Table 2, in tolerant societies against uncertainty; Expression of emotions is normal, many can be correct and rules are as needed.

As uncertainty increases, risk perception increases in the same direction. In a study on higher education students in Nevşehir; there was a significant and positive relationship between risk taking tendency and entrepreneurial potential with proactive features (Ören & Biçkes, 2011). In addition, it is determined that individuals with entrepreneurship have the ability to adapt to changes more quickly and have the ability to find a way out in the face of difficult situations. Because entrepreneurs are growing in an environment of rapidly changing and inter-individual competition.

Çetinoğlu & Büber (2012) analyzed the culture and personality traits of entrepreneurship in Ostim Organized Industrial Zone. In the research, it was seen

that the participants participated in the statements about the pragmatic, moralist, emotional and mixed personality traits of the entrepreneurs at a high level. This shows that the participants generally have mixed personality traits. According to the results of the research, the cultural system features of entrepreneurs in OSTIM Organized Industrial Zone; high power distance, high uncertainty avoidance, sociable, long-term orientation and feminine characteristics.

3. Data set and method

In Turkey, Kocaeli Vocational School of Business Administration Program students studying in the sample. Quantitative method is adopted in the research. Questionnaire questions which were prepared in five-point Likert type with the scale of cultural dimensions and proactive personality were asked. The students were asked questions about the gender of the demographic variables, whether the parents were right, the status of their parents, the income level, the education status of the parents, the number of siblings and the success level. The significance level of the analyzes using SPSS 21 program was accepted as 0.5.

4. Findings

According to the factor analysis, the KMO value of the proactive personality scale was 0.698, and the Barlett's value was 0.000. The total variance explanation rate of the related scale is 54,296. According to the factor analysis, the KMO value of the uncertainty avoidance dimension is 0,850 and the Barlett's value is 0,000. The total variance explanation rate of the uncertainty avoidance variable is 57,632. Cerny & Kaiser (1977) stated that KMO value should exceed 0.60 (Uhrmann *et. al.*, 2017: 82). Bartlett testinin kabul edilebilir p değeri <0,05 olmalıdır. As a result of the analyzes, it is seen that the sample volume of both variables is sufficient and there is a sufficient correlation between the factors. Interpretation of Cronbach's alpha coefficient is quite easy. As the coefficient approaches 1, it is concluded that the internal consistency of the items in the scale is high. (Kartal & Mor Dirlik, 2016: 1870). Scale reliability was found to be high.

Table 3. Reliability values related to scales

Variables	Reliability Cronbach's Alpha	Item
Proactive personality	0,838	8
Avoidance of uncertainty	0,666	9

An expression item belonging to the scale of uncertainty avoidance was excluded from the analysis as it reduced the reliability. The expression clause extracted from the scale is as follows: "Our anger and emotions should be exposed.". Uncertainty avoidance scale was analyzed as 9 items.

Table 4. Descriptive values belonging to variables

	n	Average	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis
Gender	154	1,64	0,49	-0,43	-1,40
Family Income	154	2,34	1,21	1,99	5,27
Mother Education	154	1,19	0,57	4,00	19,19
Father Education	154	1,53	0,84	1,93	3,68
Is the mother alive?	154	1,01	0,13	7,02	47,93
Is the father alive?	154	1,09	0,29	2,74	5,59
Mother job status	154	4,35	1,35	-1,83	1,79
Father job status	154	2,20	1,50	0,89	-0,62
Number of siblings	154	2,67	0,96	-0,09	-1,00
Success status	154	2,72	0,68	-0,08	-0,14

The data were tested for normality, and according to the results of this test, nonparametric tests were applied for the data which do not comply with these values. Kruskal Wallis, Mann Whitney U test was applied to the data. In addition, correlation and regression analyzes were performed.

Table 5. Information about demographic variables

Variables	n	%	Variables	n	%
<i>Gender</i>			<i>Family income level</i>		
Male	56	36,4	Less than 1499 TL	28	18,2
Female	98	63,6	1500-2999 TL	79	51,3
<i>Mother education status</i>			3000-4499 TL	32	20,8
Primary edu.	132	85,7	4500-5999 TL	6	3,9
High school	18	11,7	6000-7499 TL	4	2,6
Undergraduate	1	0,6	7500-8999 TL	0	0
Graduate	2	1,3	9000 TL and above	5	3,2
Postgraduate	1	0,6	<i>Mother job status</i>		
<i>Father education status</i>			Self-employment	18	11,7
Primary edu.	95	61,7	Public staff	1	0,6
High school	47	30,5	Private staff	10	6,5
Undergraduate	2	1,3	Subcontractor	5	3,2
Graduate	9	5,8	Not working	119	77,3
Postgraduate	1	0,6	Retired	1	0,6
<i>Is the mother alive?</i>			<i>Father job status</i>		
Alive	151	98,1	Self-employment	80	51,9
Death	3	1,9	Public staff	18	11,7
<i>Is the father alive?</i>			Private staff	25	16,2
Alive	139	90,3	Subcontractor	8	5,2
Death	15	9,7	Not working	22	14,3
			Retired	1	0,6
<i>Number of siblings</i>			<i>Success status</i>		
1	18	11,7	Less than 0.99	4	2,6
2	51	33,1	1.00-1.99	51	33,1
3	48	31,2	2.00-2.99	83	53,9
4 and above	37	24,0	3.00-4.00	16	10,4

4.1. Analysis of demographic variables

Mann Whitney U and Kruskal Wallis test were applied to demographic variables. The analysis results are shown in the table below.

Table 6. Relationship between gender, proactive personality and uncertainty avoidance

		n	Mean rank	Rank total	U	p
Proactive personality	Male	56	77,31	4329,50	2733,50	0,96
	Female	98	77,61	7605,50		
		n	Mean rank	Rank total	U	p
Avoidance of uncertainty	Male	56	78,31	4385,50	2698,50	0,86
	Female	98	77,04	7549,50		

Table 6 shows that there is no significant relationship between gender and proactive personality and gender and avoidance of uncertainty. Because p value is greater than five percent.

Table 7. The relationship between mother's survival status and proactive personality & uncertainty avoidance

		n	Mean rank	Rank total	U	p
Proactive personality	Alive	151	76,67	11577,00	101,00	0,10
	Death	3	119,33	358,00		
		n	Mean rank	Rank total	U	p
Avoidance of uncertainty	Alive	151	77,04	11633,50	157,50	0,36
	Death	3	100,50	358,00		

When Table 7 is examined, it is seen that there is no significant relationship between mother's survival status and proactive personality (p value> 0.05). Similarly, there was no significant relationship between the status of mother's survival status and avoidance of uncertainty (p value> 0.05).

Table 8. The Relationship between father's survival status and proactive personality & uncertainty avoidance

		n	Mean rank	Rank total	U	p
Proactive personality	Alive	139	78,27	10880,00	935,00	0,13
	Death	15	70,33	1055,00		
		n	Mean rank	Rank total	U	p
Avoidance of uncertainty	Alive	139	79,27	11018,00	797,00	0,51
	Death	15	61,13	917,00		

Journal of Economic and Social Thought

When Table 8 is examined, it is seen that there is no significant relationship between father's survival status and proactive personality and father's survival status and uncertainty avoidance (p value> 0.05).

Table 9. *Relationship between income status and proactive personality & avoidance of uncertainty*

	Income	n	Mean rank	X ²	p
Proactive personality	Less than 1499 TL	28	79,45	3,03	0,69
	1500-2999 TL	79	79,21		
	3000-4499 TL	32	75,44		
	4500-5999 TL	6	61,50		
	6000-7499 TL	4	97,75		
	7500-8999 TL	0	0		
	9000 TL and above	5	55,80		
	Income	n	Mean rank	X ²	p
Avoidance of uncertainty	Less than 1499 TL	28	80,07	8,45	0,13
	1500-2999 TL	79	79,87		
	3000-4499 TL	32	80,48		
	4500-5999 TL	6	36,33		
	6000-7499 TL	4	90,13		
	7500-8999 TL	0	0		
	9000 TL and above	5	45,80		

When Table 9 is examined, it is seen that there is no significant relationship between income level and proactive personality and income level and avoidance of uncertainty (p value> 0.05).

Table 10. *Relationship between maternal educational status and proactive personality and avoidance of uncertainty*

	Mother education status	n	Mean rank	X ²	p
Proactive personality	Primary edu.	132	79,09	8,23	0,08
	High school	18	62,61		
	Undergraduate	1	111,00		
	Graduate	2	128,00		
	Postgraduate	1	1,50		
	Mother education status	n	Mean rank	X ²	p
Avoidance of uncertainty	Primary edu.	132	80,15	4,45	0,34
	High school	18	60,97		
	Undergraduate	1	48,50		
	Graduate	2	87,75		
	Postgraduate	1	33,50		

When Table 10 is examined, it is seen that there is no significant relationship between mother's education level and proactive personality and mother's educational status and avoidance of uncertainty (p value> 0.05).

Table 11. *The Relationship between father's education status and proactive personality & uncertainty avoidance*

	Father education status	n	Mean rank	X ²	p
Proactive personality	Primary edu.	95	79,19	4,10	0,39
	High school	47	73,30		
	Undergraduate	2	94,25		
	Graduate	9	86,28		
	Postgraduate	1	1,50		
	Father education status	n	Mean rank	X ²	p
Avoidance of uncertainty	Primary edu.	95	74,62	2,54	0,63
	High school	47	82,40		
	Undergraduate	2	99,75		
	Graduate	9	82,22		
	Postgraduate	1	33,50		

When Table 11 is examined, it is seen that there is no significant relationship between education level of father and proactive personality and education level

of father and uncertainty avoidance (p value> 0.05).

Table 12. *The Relationship between mother's job status and proactive personality & uncertainty avoidance*

	Mother job status	n	Mean rank	X ²	p
Proactive personality	Self-employment	18	90,86	4,83	0,43
	Public staff	1	128,0		
	Private staff	10	64,75		
	Subcontractor	5	58,40		
	Not working	119	77,08		
	Retired	1	59,00		
	Mother job status	n	Mean rank	X ²	p
Avoidance of uncertainty	Self-employment	18	72,50	2,03	0,84
	Public staff	1	55,00		
	Private staff	10	63,30		
	Subcontractor	5	87,20		
	Not working	119	79,09		
	Retired	1	94,50		

When Table 12 is examined, it is seen that there is no significant relationship between the mother's job status and proactive personality and mother's job status and avoidance of uncertainty (p value> 0.05).

Table 13. *The relationship between father's job status and proactive personality & uncertainty avoidance*

	Father job status	n	Mean rank	X ²	p
Proactive personality	Self-employment	80	83,20	4,74	0,44
	Public staff	18	82,97		
	Private staff	25	70,26		
	Subcontractor	8	59,56		
	Not working	22	67,89		
	Retired	1	59,00		
	Father job status	n	Mean rank	X ²	p
Avoidance of uncertainty	Self-employment	80	78,09	0,81	0,97
	Public staff	18	74,47		
	Private staff	25	81,06		
	Subcontractor	8	80,88		
	Not working	22	71,77		
	Retired	1	94,50		

When Table 13 is examined, it is seen that there is no significant relationship between the job status of the father and proactive personality and the job status of the father and the avoidance of uncertainty (p value> 0.05).

Table 14. *The Relationship between number of siblings and proactive personality & uncertainty avoidance*

	Number of siblings	n	Mean rank	X ²	p
Proactive personality	1	18	75,50	0,45	0,92
	2	51	75,14		
	3	48	80,84		
	4 and above	37	77,39		
	Number of siblings	n	Mean rank	X ²	p
Avoidance of uncertainty	1	18	83,14	0,86	0,83
	2	51	76,37		
	3	48	80,07		
	4 and above	37	72,97		

Table 14 shows that there is no significant relationship between number of siblings and proactive personality and number of siblings and uncertainty avoidance (p value> 0.05).

Table 15. *The relationship between success status and proactive personality & uncertainty avoidance*

	Success Status	n	Mean rank	X ²	p
Proactive personality	Less than 0.99	4	65,25	1,18	0,75
	1.00-1.99	51	82,25		
	2.00-2.99	83	76,19		
	3.00-4.00	16	72,22		
	Success Status	n	Mean rank	X ²	p
Avoidance of uncertainty	Less than 0.99	4	44,88	4,36	0,22
	1.00-1.99	51	72,51		
	2.00-2.99	83	79,61		
	3.00-4.00	16	90,63		

When Table 15 is examined, it is seen that there is no significant relationship between success status and proactive personality and success status and avoidance of uncertainty (p value> 0.05).

Table 16. *Correlation coefficients of variables*

Variables	N	R
Proactive personality	1	,31**
Avoidance of uncertainty		1

Notes: ** p<0,01 * p<0,05

A correlation coefficient close to zero indicates a weak relationship. The correlation coefficient, which is close to one, shows a strong relationship (Tekin, 2014: 102). As stated, the 0.31 correlation between variables indicates a low level of relationship. There is a low and positive relationship between proactive personality and avoidance of uncertainty.

Table 17. *Uncertainty avoidance regression analysis with proactive personality*

Independent variable	R ²	B	t	F	p
Proactive personality	,10	,31	4,12	16,98	,00

Notes: The dependent variable “Avoidance of uncertainty” p<0,05

According to the results of regression analysis, there was a significant and positive relationship between proactive personality and avoidance of uncertainty (p> 0.05).

5. Conclusion

The aim of the study is to examine the relationship between proactive personality structures and students’ avoidance avoidance attitudes. It was observed that there was no significant relationship between demographic values and proactive personality and avoidance of uncertainty. There was a low and positive relationship between proactive personality and avoidance of uncertainty. The results obtained from the analysis can be explained by the predominance of the characteristics of Turkish society. While students want to achieve individual success and independence, they are afraid to go beyond social norms. While students want to evaluate the opportunities that are in front of them, they also care about the social structure and experience the dilemma.

References

- Ağca, V., & Kurt, M. (2007). İç girişimcilik ve temel belirleyicileri: kavramsal bir çerçeve, *Erciyes Üniversitesi İİBF Dergisi*, 29(2), 83-112.
- Akgündüz, Y., Gök, Ö.A., & Alkan, C. (2017). Örgütsel destek algısı, iş stresi, işin anlamlılığı ve proaktif kişilik özelliklerinin çalışanların yaratıcılığına etkisi: Beş yıldızlı bir otel çalışanlarında uygulama. *International Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, Special Issue 1, 50-68.
- Altay, H. (2004). Güç mesafesi, erkeklik-dişilik ve belirsizlikten kaçınma özellikleri ile başarı arasındaki ilişkilerin incelenmesine yönelik bir araştırma. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 9(1), 301-321.
- Antoncic, B., & Hisrich, R.D. (2001). Intrapreneurship: Construct refinement and cross-cultural validation. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16(5), 495-527. doi. [10.1016/S0883-9026\(99\)00054-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026(99)00054-3)
- Azizoğlu, R.O. (2011). *Kültürün örgütsel iletişim üzerine etkisi: iki farklı ülkede faaliyet gösteren iki işletme arasında karşılaştırmalı bir araştırma*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İşletme Anabilim Dalı, Ankara.
- Bateman, T.S., & Crant, J.M. (1993). The proactive component of organizational behavior: A measure and correlates. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14(2), 103-118. Doi. [10.1002/job.4030140202](https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030140202)
- Blatt, S.J., & Zuroff, D.C. (1992). Interpersonal relatedness and self-definition: Two prototypes for depression. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 12(5), 527-562. doi. [10.1016/0272-7358\(92\)90070-O](https://doi.org/10.1016/0272-7358(92)90070-O)
- Bulut, Ç., Fiş, A.M., Aktan, B., & Yılmaz, S. (2007). Kurumsal girişimcilik: Kavramsal yapı üzerine bir tartışma. *Yaşar Üniversitesi Dergisi*, 3(10), 490-520.
- Chelariu, C., Brashear, T.G., Osmonbekov, T., & Zait, A. (2008). Entrepreneurial propensity in a transition economy: Exploring micro-level and meso-level cultural antecedents, *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 23(6), 405-415. doi. [10.1108/088558620810894454](https://doi.org/10.1108/088558620810894454)
- Clark, D.A., & Beck, A.T. (1991). Personality factors in dysphoria: A psychometric refinement of beck's sociotropy-autonomy scale. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, 13(4), 369-388. doi. [10.1007/BF00960448](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00960448)
- Çaloğlu, D.Ö. (2014). *Örgütsel sessizlik ve kültürel değişkenler üzerine ampirik bir araştırma*. Ufuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi Basılmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara.
- Çetinoğlu, T., & Büber, R. (2012). Ostim organize sanayi bölgesinde girişimcilik açısından kültür ve girişimcilik özelliklerinin analizine yönelik bir alan araştırması. *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 33, 103-210.
- Doğan, B. (2007). *Örgüt Kültürü*. İstanbul: Beta Basın Yayın Dağıtım.
- Doğan, T. (2013). Beş faktör kişilik özellikleri ve öznel iyi oluş. *Doğuş Üniversitesi Dergisi*, 14(1), 56-64.
- Duygulu, E. (2008). Algılanan kurumsal görünüm, proaktif kişilik özelliği ve iş kurma (girişimcilik) tutumu, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü öğrencileri üzerine bir inceleme. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 10(2), 95-120.
- Güzel, M. (2010). Araştırma-reaktif ve proaktif kişilikler, [Retrieved from].
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations Across Nations*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Hong, J.S., Tsai, C.Y., Yang, T.C., Liu, C.H., & Hu, D.C. (2016). Exploring the relationship between proactive personality, work environment and employee creativity among tourism and hospitality employees. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 54(1), 25-34. doi. [10.1016/j.ijhm.2016.01.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2016.01.004)
- Kaasa, A., & Vadi, M. (2008). How does culture contribute to innovation? Evidence from European countries, *University of Tartu, Faculty of Economics and Business Administration*. [Retrieved from].
- Kartal, S., & Mor-Dirlik, E. (2016). Geçerlik kavramının tarihsel gelişimi ve güvenilirlikte en çok tercih edilen yöntem: Cronbach alfa katsayısı. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 16(4), 1865-1879.
- Karlı, H.O. (2018). Kişilik özellikleri ve girişimcilik niyeti arasındaki ilişkinin proaktif kişilik boyutu açısından incelenmesi. Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Basılmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara.
- Knight, G.A. (1997). Cross-cultural reliability and validity of a scale to measure firm entrepreneurial orientation. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 12(3), 213-225. doi. [10.1016/S0883-9026\(96\)00065-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026(96)00065-1)
- Korkmaz, S. (2000). Girişimcilik ve üniversite öğrencilerinin girişimcilik özelliklerinin belirlenmesine yönelik bir araştırma, *Hacettepe Üniversitesi İİBF Dergisi*, 18(1), 163-169.
- Köknel, Ö. (1999). *Kaygıdan Mutluluğa Kişilik*. İstanbul: Altın Kitaplar Yayınevi.
- Lee, S.M., & Peterson S. (2000). Culture, entrepreneurial orientation, and global competitiveness. *Journal of World Business*, 35(4), 401-416. doi. [10.1016/S1090-9516\(00\)00045-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1090-9516(00)00045-6)
- McCrae R.R., & Costa P.T. (1990). *Personality in Adulthood*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Oliver, E.G., & Karen S.C. (1999). Cultural influences on managerial choices: an empirical study of employee benefit plans in The United States. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 30(4), 745-762. doi. [10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8490837](https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8490837)

- Öktem, M.K., Leblebici, D.N., Arslan, M., Kılıç, M., & Aydın, M.D. (2003). Girişimci örgütsel kültür ve çalışanların iç girişimcilik düzeyi: uygulamalı bir çalışma. *H.Ü. İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 21(1), 169-188.
- Öncül M.S., Deniz M., & İnce A.R. (2016). Hofstede'nin örgüt kültürü modelinin potansiyel girişimcilerin yetiştiği çevresel özellikler kapsamında değerlendirilmesi, *Akademik Yaklaşımlar Dergisi*, 7(1), 255-269.
- Otacıoğlu, S.G. (2008). Müzik öğretmenlerinin sosyotropik ve otonom kişilik özellikleri ile depresyon düzeyleri üzerine ilişkisel bir araştırma, *Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 9(1), 35-50.
- Park, H., Borde, S.F. & Choi, Y. (2002). Determinants of insurance pervasiveness: a cross-national analysis. *International Business Review*, 11(1), 79-96. doi. [10.1016/S0969-5931\(01\)00048-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0969-5931(01)00048-8)
- Ören, K., & Bıçkes, M. (2011). Kişilik özelliklerinin girişimcilik potansiyeli üzerindeki etkileri (Nevşehir'deki yüksek öğrenim öğrencileri üzerinde yapılan bir araştırma), *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 16(3), 67-86.
- Poon, J.M.L., Ainuddin, R.A., & Junit, S.H. (2006). Effects of self-concept traits and entrepreneurial orientation on firm performance. *International Small Business Journal*, 24(1), 61-82. doi. [10.1177/0266242606059779](https://doi.org/10.1177/0266242606059779)
- Presbitero, A. (2015). Proactivity in career development of employees: the roles of proactive personality and cognitive complexity. *Career Development International*, 20(5), 525-538. doi. [10.1108/CDI-03-2015-0043](https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-03-2015-0043)
- Serinkan, C., & Barutçu, E. (2006). Pamukkale Üniversitesi İİBF öğrencilerinin kariyer planları ve sosyotropik-otonomi kişilik özelliklerine ilişkin bir araştırma. *Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi İİBF Dergisi*, 8(2), 317-339.
- Şahin, S., & Aksu, G.S. (2015). *İdari göreve sahip akademisyenlerin kişilik özellikleri ile kullandıkları çatışma çözme stilleri ilişkisi: izmir ili örneği*, 16(2), 135-154.
- Taymur, İ., & Türkçapar, M.H. (2012). Kişilik: tanımı, sınıflaması ve değerlendirmesi, psikiyatride güncel yaklaşımlar. *Current Approaches in Psychiatry*, 4(2), 154-177.
- Todorovic, Z.W., McNaughton, R.B., & Guild, P. (2011). ENTRE-U: An Entrepreneurial Orientation Scale For Universities, *Technovation*, 31(2-3), 128-137. doi. [10.1016/j.technovation.2010.10.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2010.10.009)
- Tosunoğlu, B., & Yeşilçelebi, G. (2016). Kültürün iç denetim üzerindeki etkisinin muhasebe meslek mensupları açısından değerlendirilmesi. *Journal of Accounting, Finance and Auditing Studies*, 2(1), 73-87.
- Uzuntarla, Y., Fırat, İ., & Ceyhan, S. (2016). Kolektivizm ve belirsizlikten kaçınma davranışı arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi: Üniversite öğrencileri örneği. *Uluslararası Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 3(6), 206-216.
- Uhrman, L., Nordli, H., Fekete, O., & Bonsaksen, T. (2017). Perceptions of a Norwegian clubhouse among its members: A psychometric evaluation of a user satisfaction tool. *The International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*, 21(2), 82-91. doi. [10.2147/JMDH.S184003](https://doi.org/10.2147/JMDH.S184003)
- Ülgen, M., & Mirze, K. (2004). *İşletmelerde Stratejik Yönetim*. İstanbul: Literatür Yayınları.
- Yeloğlu, H.O. (2011). Türk toplumsal kültürünün örgüt yapılarına olan etkilerinin belirlenmesine yönelik bir çalışma. *ODÜ Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Sosyal Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2(4), 153-170.



Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0>).

